

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 remain in this application, unamended in this, or any previous paper.

Claims 1, 19, 23, 26, 28, 30, 38, 43, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, and 60 are rejected for anticipation by Larsson. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The *prima facie* elements of anticipation have been set forth in the previous paper submitted by the applicant in this application. Each of these claims includes a step of "initiating the transfer of calls from the first telephone to the second telephone ...", or an element for "transferring telephone calls from the first telephone to the second telephone." In each case, "transferring" from one telephone to another is intended to convey the same result as "call forwarding", although by novel means. In this regard, see the specification at page 1, line 10 through page 2, line 9. Thus, "transferring" in the rejected claims means to shift an incoming call from one telephone to another telephone. This is not what Larsson means by "transfer." In Larsson, the "transfer function" is described at Col. 1, ll. 40-55 refers to a call made by a first subscriber and initially received at a telephone exchange. According to Larsson's definition, the call is one which is received in the "telephone exchange unit on a first input terminal and which, subsequent to evaluation, shall be connected to one of said evaluated, available mobile subscriber apparatus ...". In other words, in Larsson, a call received at a telephone exchange unit is evaluated and then "transferred" from the telephone exchange unit to an evaluated "subscriber apparatus", not from one telephone to another as recited in the rejected claims. In this sense, the call is in fact completed between the calling subscriber unit and the receiving subscriber unit. This is consistent with the description at Col. 7, ll. 10-25 of Larsson, in which a call of a "calling subscriber apparatus" is received first at a telephone exchange unit and then transferred to a "selected nearby available called subscriber apparatus." The call clearly is not transferred from the calling apparatus to the called apparatus. Accordingly Larsson omits a step of "initiating the transfer of calls from the first telephone to the second telephone ...", and an element for "transferring telephone calls from the first telephone to the second telephone ..." in the description of a telecommunications system. If this missing subject matter is considered to be inherent in the described telecommunications system, the applicants respectfully request the introduction of extrinsic evidence establishing that the omitted subject matter is necessarily in the described telecommunications system, and would be so recognized by those skilled in the art. Otherwise, Larsson does not anticipate these claims, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2, 3, 34, 36, 61, and 62 are all rejected for obviousness over Larsson, in view of Hayashin. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Prima facie, rejection of a claim for obviousness over a combination of references requires that the combination be suggested in the references themselves, or in the prior art, that there be some reasonable expectation of success, and that all steps and elements, and all limitations thereof be found in the combination, explicitly or by suggestion.

The proposed combination fails to satisfy at least the third requirement of *prima facie* obviousness because it omits a step and an element for "transferring" a call from one telephone to another, for reasons given above. If the missing subject matter is considered to be suggested by or for the combination, the applicants respectfully request citation of a reference, or entry of a statement to this effect. Otherwise, these claims are not obvious in view of the proposed combination, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 5, 9, 16, and 37 have been rejected for obviousness over Larsson in view of Hayashin and Aldermeshian. This rejection is traversed for the reasons given in traversal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 34, 36, 61, and 62 for obviousness over Larsson and Hayashin alone, and the applicants respectfully request its withdrawal.

Claims 11-13 and 31 are rejected for obviousness over Larsson in view of Shaughnessy. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The proposed combination fails to satisfy at least the third requirement of *prima facie* obviousness because it omits a step and an element for "transferring" a call from one telephone to another, for reasons given above. If the missing subject matter is considered to be suggested by or for the combination, the applicants respectfully request citation of a reference, or entry of a statement to this effect. Otherwise, these claims are not obvious in view of the proposed combination, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 14, 17, 21, 48, and 51 are rejected for obviousness over Larsson. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The proposed modification of Larsson fails to satisfy at least the third requirement of *prima facie* obviousness because it omits a step and an element for "transferring" a call from one telephone to another, for reasons given above. If the missing subject matter is considered to be suggested by or for the modified reference, the applicants respectfully request citation of a reference, or entry of a statement to this effect. Otherwise, these claims are not obvious in view of the modified reference, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 24, 25, 29, and 56 are rejected for obviousness over Larsson in view of Lygas. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The proposed combination fails to satisfy at least the third requirement of *prima facie* obviousness because it omits a step and an element for "transferring" a call from one telephone to another, for reasons given above. If the missing subject matter is considered to be suggested by or for the combination, the applicants respectfully request citation of a reference, or entry of a statement to this effect. Otherwise, these claims are not obvious in view of the proposed combination, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 4, 6-8, 15, 18, 20, 22, 27, 32, 33, 35, 39-42, 44-47, 49, 54, and 58 are objected to for dependence on rejected base claims. In view of the reasons given above for patentability of those base claims, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that all of the claims in this application are patentable in view of the references of record, early notice of which is earnestly requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50/2258.

Respectfully submitted



TERRANCE A. MEADOR
Reg. No. 30, 298

Date: 18 February 2003

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92121-2133

Telephone: (858) 638-6747 Fax: (858) 638-6727